

III. Remarks

As indicated, independent claims that were substantively rejected in the final office action of March 25, 2005, have each been amended to incorporate limit(s) of an allowed dependent claim. In particular, the limit(s) of allowed dependent claim 258 have been incorporated into independent claim 254; the limit(s) of allowed dependent claim 332 (and intervening claim 331) have been incorporated into independent claim 328; the limit(s) of allowed dependent claim 399 have been incorporated into independent claim 358; the limit(s) of allowed dependent claim 411 (and intervening claim 410) have been incorporated into independent claim 359; the limit(s) of allowed dependent claim 375 have been incorporated into independent claim 360; and the limit(s) of allowed dependent claim 393 have been incorporated into independent claim 378. Thus, such amended independent claims should be allowable.

The amendments submitted herein should be understood to be made as a practicality only, and should not to be construed as creating any situation of file wrapper estoppel or the like as all rights are expressly reserved and may be pursued in this or other applications, such as divisionals, continuations, or continuations-in-part if desired. Relatedly, it should be understood that the amendments made herein are made for tangential issues of clarity and as a matter of the Office's convenience or expedience only. The amendments should not be interpreted as any sort of admission that the examiner's concerns are correct or proper, or as an action that in any way surrenders a particular equivalency, surrenders any right to patent coverage, or otherwise limits any rights which the Assignee may now or hereafter assert. It should be understood that, unless and to the extent deemed broadened by this amendment, and even as amended, the Assignee expressly reserves all rights, including but not limited to: all rights to maintain the scope of literal coverage with respect to any element as may have existed under the language previously presented, all rights to maintain the scope of equivalency coverage as may have existed under the language previously presented, and all rights to re-present the prior language at any time in this or any subsequent application. To the extent currently foreseeable, no change or reduction in direct or equivalency coverage is


believed to exist, and no change or reduction in direct or equivalency coverage is intended through the presentation of this amendment.

IV. Conclusion

In a March 25, 2005 final office action communication, the Office raised concerns as to certain claims. In response to this office action communication the Assignee submits this amendment after final office action and request for reconsideration to fully address the Office's March 25, 2005 office action. The Assignee believes all concerns have been addressed and that all claims remaining in the case are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of the case is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Dated this 25th day of May, 2005.

Respectfully submitted,
SANTANGELO LAW OFFICES, P.C.



Alfred K. Wiedmann Jr.
Attorney for Assignee
USPTO Reg. No. 48,033
125 South Howes, Third Floor
Fort Collins, CO 80521
(970) 224-3100